Optimal Attack Strategies Subject to Detection Constraints Against Cyber-Physical Systems

Yuan Chen, Soummya Kar, and José M. F. Moura

arXiv:1610.03370v1 [math.OC] 11 Oct 2016

Abstract

This paper studies an attacker against a cyber-physical system (CPS) whose goal is to move the state of a CPS to a target state while ensuring that his or her probability of being detected does not exceed a given bound. The attacker's probability of being detected is related to the nonnegative bias induced by his or her attack on the CPS' detection statistic. We formulate a linear quadratic cost function that captures the attacker's control goal and establish constraints on the induced bias that reflect the attacker's detection-avoidance objectives. When the attacker is constrained to be detected at the false-alarm rate of the detector, we show that the optimal attack strategy reduces to a linear feedback of the attacker's state estimate. In the case that the attacker's bias is upper bounded by a positive constant, we provide two algorithms – an optimal algorithm and a sub-optimal, less computationally intensive algorithm – to find suitable attack sequences. Finally, we illustrate our attack strategies in numerical examples based on a remotely-controlled helicopter under attack.

I. Introduction

Security vulnerabilities in cyber-physical systems (CPS), systems that interface sensing, communication, and control with an underlying physical process, allow for sophisticated cyber attacks that cause catastrophic physical harm. In the past, events such as StuxNet [1] and the Maroochy Sewage Control Incident [2] have demonstrated the vulnerability of industrial processes. More recently, cyber-physical attacks have targeted automobiles [3], military vehicles [4], and commercial drones [5]. These examples show that CPS remain susceptible to cyber-attacks, and, in response, there have been significant efforts to improve the security of CPS.

Part of the effort in improving cyber-physical security has been devoted to categorizing different types of attacks and developing security countermeasures for each type [1], [6]. One particular type of attack is the integrity attack, in which an attacker manipulates the CPS' sensor readings and alters its actuator control signals [6], [7]. Prior work has analyzed CPS security sensor attacks, determining the fundamental limits of attack detection [8] and

Yuan Chen {(412)-268-7103}, Soummya Kar {(412)-268-8962}, and José M.F. Moura {(412)-268-6341, fax: (412)-268-3890} are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15217 {yuanchel, soummyak, moura}@andrew.cmu.edu

This material is based upon work supported by the Department of Energy under Award Number de-oe0000779 and by DARPA under agreement number DARPA FA8750-12-2-0291. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation thereon. The views and conclusions contained herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies or endorsements, either expressed or implied, of DARPA or the U.S. Government.

developing methods to reconstruct sensor attacks [9]–[11]. Existing work has also studied the capabilities of an integrity attacker, relating the ability of the attacker to perform undetectable attacks to certain geometric control-theoretic properties of the CPS [12]–[14]. For systems affected by process and sensor noise, references [7] and [15] characterize the state estimation error caused by an attacker who tries to avoid detection.

In addition to analyzing the *ability* of an integrity attacker to cause damage and evade detection, prior work has also studied *how* an attacker should behave in order to achieve his or her objectives. Reference [16] considers a noisy CPS and designs an attack to optimally disrupt the system's feedback controller while avoiding detection. Instead of attackers who seek to cause general disruption and damage to a CPS, our previous work studies attackers with specific control objectives [17], [18]. In [18], we considered an attacker whose goal is move the CPS to a target state while evading detection, formulated a cost function that penalized the deviation from the target state and the magnitude of the detection statistic, and we determined the optimal attack for such a cost function reduced to a linear feedback of the attacker's state estimate.

This paper studies an attacker who wishes to move the system to a target state, but, unlike in [18], we impose an explicit bound on the probability of an attack being detected. We model the CPS as a linear dynamical system subject to sensor and process noise equipped with a Kalman Filter for state estimation and an LQG controller. The CPS uses a χ^2 detector as an attack detector, which reports an attack if the energy of the Kalman Filter innovation exceeds a certain threshold [19]. The attacker's goal is to design a sequence of attacks that counters the system's LQG controller and minimizes the deviation of the CPS' state from the target state subject to a bound on the (non-negative) bias induced on the χ^2 detection statistic.

We define a linear quadratic cost function that captures the attacker's control objective by penalizing the distance between the system's state and the target state. Then, we formulate the attack design problem as an optimization problem of finding a sequence of attacks that minimizes the cost function subject to an upper bound constraint on the bias induced in the detection statistic. This differs from our previous work [18], in which we studied *unconstrained* attack design. This paper requires techniques, not found in [18], to handle the constraints in the optimization problem. In particular, since we compute the optimal attack sequence in a causal manner, we restrict attacks at each time step to be *recursively feasible* [20] to ensure that it is possible to satisfy the constraints of future time steps. The constraints in our attack design problem also require methods outside of those found in existing work on constrained linear quadratic control [21]–[23]. Instead of placing constraints directly on the state or the attack, we constrain the attacker's probability of being detected, which we relate to a parameter that depends on the attack through a dynamical system.

We consider separately the cases in which the induced bias is constrained to be zero and in which the induced bias is upper bounded by a positive constant. For the former case, which corresponds to the restriction that the attacker be detected at the false alarm rate of the detector, we resort to constrained dynamic programming to show that the optimal attack reduces to a linear feedback strategy. For the latter case, we provide two algorithms to determine a suitable sequence of attacks. The first algorithm, which is more computationally intensive, finds an optimal sequence of attacks. The second algorithm is less computationally intensive and finds a (sub-optimal)

sequence of attacks that satisfies the detection constraint. A preliminary version of part of our work appears in [24], in which we considered designing attacks under only the false alarm rate of detection constraint against CPS that are *not* equipped with LQG controllers.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II provides the model and assumptions for the CPS and attacker, reviews the χ^2 detector and the notion of recursive feasibility, and formally states the problems we address. In Section III, we determine the set of all recursively feasible attacks at each time step. In Section IV, we use dynamic programming to find an optimal strategy for the case in which the attacker's probability of being detected is constrained to be the detector's false alarm rate. Section V studies the case in which the bias induced in the detection statistic is upper bounded by a positive constant, and we provide two algorithms for computing attack sequences that achieve the attacker's objectives. We provide numerical examples of a remotely-controlled helicopter under attack (from each of our proposed strategies) in Section VI, and we conclude in Section VII.

II. Background

A. Notation

Let $\mathbb{R}$ denote the reals, $\mathbb{R}^n$ denote the space of n-dimensional real (column) vectors, and $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ denote the space of real m by n matrices. The multivariate Gaussian distribution with mean μ and covariance Σ is denoted as $\mathcal{N}(\mu,\Sigma)$. The n by n identity matrix is denoted as I_n. For a matrix M, $\mathscr{R}(M)$ denotes the range space of M, $\mathscr{N}(M)$ denotes the null space of M, and $M^\dagger$ denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse. For a symmetric matrix $S=S^T$, $S\succeq 0$ denotes that S is positive semidefinite, and $S\succ 0$ denotes that S is positive definite. For $S\succ 0$, let $\|\cdot\|_S$ denote the S-weighted 2-norm. That is, for $S\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $\|x\|_S=\left\|S^{\frac{1}{2}}x\right\|_2=\sqrt{x^TSx}$.

B. System Model

We use the same, linearized[1] CPS model as [18]:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= Ax_t + Bu_t + \Gamma e_t + w_t,\\ y_t &= Cx_t + \Psi e_t + v_t, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $x_t\in\mathbb{R}^n$ describes the system's state, $u_t\in\mathbb{R}^m$ is the system input, $e_t\in\mathbb{R}^s$ is the attacker's input, and w_t and v_t are the process and sensor noise, respectively. The sensor and process noise are independently, identically distributed (i.i.d.) in time and mutually independent; w_t has distribution $\mathcal{N}(0,\Sigma_w)$, and v_t has distribution $\mathcal{N}(0,\Sigma_v)$, with $\Sigma_w,\Sigma_v\succ 0$. The system starts running at time $t=-\infty$, and the initial state of the system $x_{-\infty}$ has distribution $\mathcal{N}(0,\Sigma_x)$ with $\Sigma_x\succ 0$ and is independent of the noise processes. The pair (A,C) is observable, and the pair (A,B) is controllable. The matrices Γ and Ψ describe the attacker.

The system knows the matrices A,B, and C and the statistics of the noise processes and initial state, but does not know the matrices Γ and Ψ (since they describe the attacker). The system causally knows the system input u_t and the sensor output y_t but not the attack e_t. We assume the system's goal is to regulate the system state to the

[1]If the CPS is nonlinear, the model (1) represents its dynamics after linearization about an operating point.

origin. Because the system cannot directly observe the state x_t, it uses its sensor measurements y_t to construct an estimate of the state using a Kalman Filter. Then, the system performs feedback control on the state estimate to regulate the state to the origin. The system constructs its Kalman Filter and controller assuming nominal operating conditions (i.e., $e_t = 0$ for all t).

Under nominal operating conditions, the system's Kalman filter calculates $\widehat{x}_t$, the minimum mean square error (MMSE) estimate of x_t given all sensor measurements up to time t and input up to time $t-1$. Since the system starts at $t = -\infty$, the Kalman filter has fixed gain:

$$K = PC^T(CPC^T + \Sigma_v)^{-1}, \tag{2}$$

$$P = APA^T + \Sigma_w - APC^T(CPC^T + \Sigma_v)^{-1}CPA^T, \tag{3}$$

$$\widehat{x}_t = \widehat{x}_{t|t-1} + K\left(y_t - C\widehat{x}_{t|t-1}\right), \tag{4}$$

$$\widehat{x}_{t+1|t} = A\widehat{x}_t + Bu_t. \tag{5}$$

To regulate the state x_t, the system has a feedback controller of the form

$$u_t = L\widehat{x}_t, \tag{6}$$

where the feedback matrix L is chosen such that $A+BL$ is stable. One controller that takes the form of equation (6) is the infinite horizon LQG controller that minimizes the cost function

$$J_{\text{CPS}} = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{2T+1}\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=-T}^{T} x_t^T Q^{'} x_t + u_t^T R^{'} u_t\right],$$

where $Q^{'} \succeq 0$, $R^{'} \succ 0$, and the pair $(A, Q^{'})$ is observable.

The CPS is equipped with a χ^2 detector to determine to determine if, for some t, $e_t \neq 0$. The χ^2 attack detector [19] uses the innovations sequence of the Kalman filter, ν_t, defined as $\nu_t = y_t - C\widehat{x}_{t|t-1}$, to determine whether or not an attack has occurred. The term $\widehat{x}_{t|t-1}$ is the MMSE estimate of x_t given all sensor measurements and system input up to time $t-1$, assuming nominal operating conditions. When there is no attack (i.e., $e_t = 0$ for all t), the innovations sequence is i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_\nu)$, where $\Sigma_\nu = CPC^T + \Sigma_v$, and ν_t is orthogonal to $\widehat{x}_{t|t-1}$ [25]. The χ^2 reports an attack if the statistic $g_t = \nu_t^T \Sigma_\nu^{-1} \nu_t$, exceeds a threshold τ, which is chosen à priori to balance the false alarm and missed detection probabilities [19]. The linear, state space model with a Kalman filter, feedback controller, and χ^2 attack detector is a standard model for a CPS [18], [26], [27].

C. Attacker Model

The attacker knows the system model and statistical properties, the controller feedback matrix L, and which sensors and actuators he or she can attack (i.e. the matrices Γ and Ψ). Following [18], we assume, without loss of generality, that the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \Gamma \\ \Psi \end{bmatrix}$ is injective. The attacker causally knows the sensor output y_t and the attack e_t. Additionally, the attacker causally knows $\widetilde{y}_t = Cx_t + \nu_t$, the value of sensor output at time t before it is altered by the attack at time t. The attacker also performs Kalman filtering, separately from the system, to estimate the state.

The attacker also uses his or her knowledge to compute the estimate produced by the *system's* Kalman filter. The attacker knows L and the system's state estimate, so he or she knows u_t. The attack begins at time $t = 0$, i.e., for $t = -\infty, \ldots, -1$, $e_t = 0$. During the time interval $t = -\infty, \ldots, 0$, the attacker observes the system output and keeps track of the state estimate $\widehat{x}_t$.

The attacker's objective is to design an attack sequence over the finite time interval $t = 0$ to $t = N$ that moves the system state to a target state x^* while satisfying a detection-avoidance constraint. The attacker chooses the sequence

$$\gamma(0, N) = \{e_0, \ldots, e_N\},$$

to accomplish his or her goals such that at time t, the attack e_t only depends on the attacker's available information at time t, $\mathcal{I}_t$. Following [18], $\mathcal{I}_t$ follows the classical information pattern [25]: $\mathcal{I}_0 = \{\widetilde{y}_0\}, \mathcal{I}_{t+1} = \{\mathcal{I}_t, \widetilde{y}_{t+1}, e_t\}$. If a nonzero attack occurs, the attacker's Kalman filter then produces a different estimate than the system's Kalman filter and becomes:

$$\widehat{x}_{t+1|t} = A\widehat{x}_t + Bu_t + \Gamma e_t, \tag{7}$$

$$\widehat{x}_t = \widehat{x}_{t|t-1} + K\left(\widetilde{y}_t - C\widehat{x}_{t|t-1}\right), \tag{8}$$

The attacker's Kalman filter produces MMSE state estimate given $\mathcal{I}_t$, i.e., $\widehat{x}_t = \mathbb{E}[x_t|\mathcal{I}_t]$.

The attack $\gamma(0, t)$ induces a bias ϵ_t in the innovation ν_t. Under an attack $\gamma(0, t)$, we have $\nu_t^e = \nu_t^0 + \epsilon_t$, where the superscript ^{e} denotes a variable under attack and the superscript ^{0} denotes what the variable would have been had there been no attack (i.e., $e_0 = e_1 = \cdots = e_t = 0$). When under attack, the χ^2 detector compares the statistic $g_t^e = \nu_t^e \Sigma_\nu^{-1} \nu_t^e$ against a threshold to perform attack detection. The following state space dynamical system describes the relationship between $\gamma(0, t)$ and ϵ_t [18]:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{t+1} &= \widehat{\mathcal{A}}\theta_t + \widehat{\mathcal{B}}e_t, \\ \epsilon_t &= \widehat{\mathcal{C}}\theta_t + \widehat{\mathcal{D}}e_t, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = \begin{bmatrix} (I_n - KC)A + BL & KC & KC \\ ABL & A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}^T = \begin{bmatrix} (K\Psi)^T & 0^T & \Gamma^T \end{bmatrix}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} = \begin{bmatrix} -CA & C & C \end{bmatrix}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{D}} = \Psi$, and $\theta_0 = 0$.

The Σ_ν^{-1}-weighted 2-norm of ϵ_t relates to the probability of the attack being detected at time t [28]. Let $P_{D,t} = \mathbb{P}(g_t > \tau)$ be the detection probability at time t.

Theorem 1 (Detection Probability Bound [28])**.** *For any $\delta \in (0, \tau)$, if $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$, then*

$$P_{D,t} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(g_t^0 > \left(\sqrt{\tau} - \sqrt{\delta}\right)^2\right),$$

where g_t^0 is the value of the statistic g_t when there is no attack.[2]

[2]The statistic g_t^0 is i.i.d. (in time) χ^2 with p degrees of freedom.

If $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = 0$, then the probability of detection at time t is equal to the false alarm probability of the χ^2 detector.

To model the attacker's control objectives, define the cost function:

$$J = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{N} \|(x_t - x^*)\|^2_{Q_t}\right], \tag{10}$$

with $Q_t \succ 0$. The cost function J penalizes deviation of the state from the target state. The attacker's goal is to design an attack $\gamma(0, N)$ that achieves cost

$$\begin{aligned} J^* = \quad & \min_{\gamma(0,N)} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{N} \|(x_t - x^*)\|^2_{Q_t}\right] \\ & \text{s.t.} \qquad \|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta, \forall t = 0, \ldots, N \end{aligned}, \tag{11}$$

the minimum cost of J subject to constraints on the Σ_ν^{-1}-weighted 2-norm of ϵ_t. The constraints in the optimization problem (11) model the attacker's goals of evading detection.

D. Recursive Feasibility

The attacker designs the attack in real time: at time t, the attacker chooses the attack e_t based on his or her information $\mathcal{I}_t$. Note that the constraint $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$ in (11) is for all times $t = 0, \ldots, N$. It is necessary that the attack be recursively feasible [20]: the attack e_t must be chosen such that $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$ and, for all future times $t+1, \ldots, N$, there exist attacks $e_{t+1}, \ldots, e_N$ such that $\|\epsilon_{t+1}\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta, \ldots, \|\epsilon_N\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$. The recursive feasibility of (11) is related to the output minimization problem presented in [29]:

Lemma 1 ([29]). *Consider the system in* (9) *with arbitrary initial state θ_0. Then, for any $k = 1, 2, \ldots,$*

$$\min_{e_0, \ldots, e_{k-1}} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = \theta_0^T \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_k \theta_0, \tag{12}$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_k$ follows the solution to the Riccati equation

$$\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{k+1} = \widehat{\mathcal{A}}^T \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_k \widehat{\mathcal{A}} + \widehat{\mathcal{C}}^T \Sigma_\nu^{-1} \widehat{\mathcal{C}} - \left(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^T \Sigma_\nu^{-1} \widehat{\mathcal{C}} + \widehat{\mathcal{B}}^T \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_k \widehat{\mathcal{A}}\right)^T \left(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^T \Sigma_\nu^{-1} \widehat{\mathcal{D}} + \widehat{\mathcal{B}}^T \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_k \widehat{\mathcal{B}}\right)^{-1} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^T \Sigma_\nu^{-1} \widehat{\mathcal{C}} + \widehat{\mathcal{B}}^T \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_k \widehat{\mathcal{A}}\right), \tag{13}$$

with $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_0 = 0$.

Furthermore, the matrix $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_k$ is positive semidefinite, and $\min_{e_0, \ldots, e_{k-1}} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = 0$ if and only if $\widehat{P}_k \theta_0 = 0$ [29].

E. Augmented State Space Notation

For the remainder of this paper, we use the augmented state space description of the cyber-physical system and attacker provided in [18]. Define the augmented state

$$\xi_t^T = \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{x}_t^T & \theta_t^T & \left(\widehat{x}_t^0\right)^T & x^{*T} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{14}$$

where $\widehat{x}_t$ denotes the attacker's state estimate, and $\widehat{x}_t^0$ denotes the system's state estimate in the case that $e_0 = \cdots = e_t = 0$. The state ξ_t follows the dynamics

$$\xi_{t+1} = \mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t + \mathcal{K}\nu_{t+1}, \tag{15}$$

where ν_{t+1} denotes the attacker's innovation at time $t+1$,

$$\mathcal{A} = \text{blkdiag}\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}, A+BL, I_n\right),\ \mathcal{B}^T = \left[\begin{array}{cccc} \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^T & \widehat{\mathcal{B}}^T & 0^T & 0^T \end{array}\right],\ \mathcal{K}^T = \left[\begin{array}{cccc} K^T & 0 & K^T & 0 \end{array}\right]^T,$$

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} = \left[\begin{array}{cc} A & BL\Omega \\ 0 & \widehat{\mathcal{A}} \end{array}\right],\ \Omega = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} (I_n - KC)A + BL & KC & KC \end{array}\right],\ \text{and } \widetilde{\mathcal{B}} = \Gamma + BLK\Psi.$$

Further define $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}} = \left[\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & \widehat{\mathcal{C}} & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right]$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}} = \Psi$, and $\mathcal{H} = \left[\begin{array}{cccc} I_n & 0 & 0 & -I_n \end{array}\right]$. Then, we have

$$\epsilon_t = \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}\xi_t + \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}e_t, \tag{16}$$

$$\widehat{x}_t - x^* = \mathcal{H}\xi_t. \tag{17}$$

One important property of ξ_t is that, given $\mathcal{I}_t$, the attacker can exactly determine the value of ξ_t [18]. Accordingly, the attacker can use ξ_t to determine his or her attack at time t.

Following [18] and [25], we manipulate the cost function J by substituting $x_t = \widehat{x}_t + n_t$, where n_t is the estimation error. It is well known [25] that, given $\mathcal{I}_t$, n_t is conditionally i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}\left(0, \widehat{P}\right)$, where $\widehat{P} = P - PC^T\Sigma_\nu^{-1}CP$, and n_t is conditionally orthogonal to $\widehat{x}_t$. Performing this substitution, the optimal attack design problem becomes.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{\gamma(0,N)} & \sum\limits_{t=0}^{N} \text{trace}\left(\widehat{P}Q_t\right) + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum\limits_{t=0}^{N} \|\mathcal{H}\xi_t\|^2_{Q_t}\right] \\ \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta, \forall t = 0, \ldots, N \end{array}, \tag{18}$$

where $\sum_{t=0}^{N} \text{trace}\left(\widehat{P}Q_t\right)$ does not depend on $\gamma(0,N)$.

F. Problem Statement

This paper addresses three main problems. Consider the optimal attack design problem (18). First, determine, for any $\delta \geq 0$ and any time $t = 0, \ldots, N$, the set of recursively feasible attacks. Second, find an optimal attack sequence $\gamma(0,N)$ when $\delta = 0$. This corresponds to finding the optimal attack under the constraint that the probability of being detected at any time t is equal to the false alarm probability of the detector. Third, find an optimal attack sequence $\gamma(0,N)$ when $\delta > 0$.

III. Feasibility Sets

In this section, we determine which attacks e_t are recursively feasible at time t. Recursively feasible attacks are attacks e_t such that $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$ and there exists $e_{t+1}, \ldots, e_N$ such that $\|\epsilon_{t+1}\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta, \ldots, \|\epsilon_N\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$. From equations (15) and (16), we see that the recursively feasibility of an attack e_t depends on the state ξ_t. Define the sets Ξ_t, $t = 0, \ldots, N$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_N &= \left\{ \xi_N \in \mathbb{R}^{6n} \middle| \exists e_N, \left\| \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}\xi_N + \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}e_N \right\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta \right\}, \\ \Xi_t &= \left\{ \xi_t \in \mathbb{R}^{6n} \middle| \exists e_t, \left\| \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}\xi_t + \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}e_t \right\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta, \mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t \in \Xi_{t+1} \right\},\ t = 0, \ldots, N-1. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

In the definition of $\Xi_t, t = 0, \ldots, N-1$, we have the condition $\mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t \in \Xi_{t+1}$, which ignores the term $\mathcal{K}\nu_{t+1}$. From the structure of $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathcal{K}$, we see that membership in Ξ_t depends only on the θ_t component of ξ_t, which

is unaffected by $\mathcal{K}\nu_{t+1}$. That is, we have $\mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t \in \Xi_{t+1}$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t + \mathcal{K}\nu_{t+1} \in \Xi_{t+1}$ for any $\nu_{t+1} \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

We use the sets Ξ_t to determine the existence of recursively feasible attacks at time t.

Lemma 2. *There exists a recursively feasible attack e_t if and only if $\xi_t \in \Xi_t$. That is, there exists a sequence of attacks $\gamma(t, N) = \{e_t, \dots, e_N\}$ such that $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta, \dots, \|\epsilon_N\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$ if and only if $\xi_t \in \Xi_t$.*

The proof of Lemma 2 is found in the appendix. The set Ξ_t is nonempty for all $t = 0, \dots, N$ – any ξ_t that has a θ_t component of $\theta_t = 0$ belongs to Ξ_t. This is because if $\theta_t = 0$, then, following system (9), the attack sequence $\gamma(t, N) = \{0, \dots, 0\}$ is one such that $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = \cdots = \|\epsilon_N\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = 0$. Recall that system (9) has initial state $\theta_0 = 0$, so we have $\xi_0 \in \Xi_0$. This means that the optimization problem (18) is feasible for any nonnegative value of δ, i.e., the attacker can always satisfy the detection constraint by choosing not to attack the system.

IV. Attacks Under False Alarm Constraints

In this section, we find an attack sequence $\gamma(0, N)$ that minimizes the cost function J under the constraint that $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = 0$, corresponding to finding the optimal attack under the restriction that the probability of being detected is equal to the false alarm probability of the detector. For the case of $\delta = 0$, we can relate the sets Ξ_t to the output minimization problem presented in Lemma 1 and [29]. Define

$$\mathcal{G} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{3n} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{20}$$

The matrix $\mathcal{G}$ selects the variable θ_t from ξ_t (i.e., $\mathcal{G}\xi_t = \theta_t$).

Lemma 3. *For $\delta = 0$ and for $t = 0, \dots, N$, the set Ξ_t is the null space of $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{N-t+1}\mathcal{G}$. That is, $\Xi_t = \mathscr{N}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{N-t+1}\mathcal{G}\right)$.*

The proof of Lemma 3 is found in the appendix.

The following theorem gives the optimal sequence of attacks when $\delta = 0$.

Theorem 2 (Optimal Attack Strategy with $\delta = 0$ Detection Constraint)**.** *An attack sequence $\gamma(0, N)$ that solves* (18) *with $\delta = 0$ is*

$$e_t = -\mathcal{F}_t \left(\mathcal{F}_t^T \mathcal{B}^T \mathcal{Q}_{t+1} \mathcal{B} \mathcal{F}_t\right)^\dagger \mathcal{F}_t^T \mathcal{B}^T \mathcal{Q}_{t+1} \left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_t^\dagger \mathcal{C}_t\right) \xi_t - \mathcal{D}_t^\dagger \mathcal{C}_t \xi_t, \tag{21}$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_N = \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}, \quad \mathcal{D}_N = \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}, \quad \mathcal{F}_N = I_s - \mathcal{D}_N^\dagger \mathcal{D}_N, \tag{22}$$

and, for $t = 0, \dots, N-1$,

$$\mathcal{C}_t = \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{N-t}\mathcal{G}\mathcal{A} \\ \widetilde{\mathcal{C}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{D}_t = \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{N-t}\widehat{\mathcal{B}} \\ \widetilde{\mathcal{D}} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{23}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_t = I_s - \mathcal{D}_t^\dagger \mathcal{D}_t. \tag{24}$$

The matrix $\mathcal{Q}_t$ is given recursively backward in time by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}_t = \mathcal{H}^T Q_t \mathcal{H} + \left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_t^\dagger \mathcal{C}_t\right)^T \mathcal{Q}_{t+1} \left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_t^\dagger \mathcal{C}_t\right) \\ - \left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_t^\dagger \mathcal{C}_t\right)^T \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t \left(\mathcal{F}_t^T \mathcal{B}^T \mathcal{Q}_{t+1} \mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right)^\dagger \mathcal{F}_t^T \mathcal{B}^T \mathcal{Q}_{t+1} \left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_t^\dagger \mathcal{C}_t\right),\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

with terminal condition $\mathcal{Q}_{N+1} = 0$.

Theorem 2 states the the optimal attack under the $\delta = 0$ detection constraint is a linear feedback of the state ξ_t, which is exactly determined by the attacker information $\mathcal{I}_t$. Equation (21) shows that the optimal attack e_t depends on the matrix $\mathcal{F}_t$, which in turn depends on the matrix $\mathcal{D}_t$. If the matrix $\mathcal{D}_t$ has full column rank, then, by definition, $\mathcal{F}_t = 0$. If the matrix $\mathcal{D}_t$ has full column rank for all $t = 0, \ldots, N-1$, then the optimal attack becomes $\gamma(0, N) = \{0, \ldots, 0\}$. This corresponds to the case in which the attacker is not powerful enough and his or her only option to satisfy the $\delta = 0$ detection constraint is to not attack system.

Before we prove Theorem 2, we provide intermediate results that show that the optimal attack exists and that the optimal attack sequence $e_0, \ldots, e_{N-1}$ is unique (the attack e_N may not be unique). The proofs are found in the appendix.

Lemma 4. *For all $t = 0, \ldots, N$, there exists $\mathcal{U}_t \succeq 0$ such that $\mathcal{Q}_t = \mathcal{H}^T Q_t \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{U}_t$.*

Lemma 5. *For all $t = 0, \ldots, N-1$, $\mathscr{R}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T \mathcal{B}^T\right) = \mathscr{R}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T \mathcal{B}^T \mathcal{Q}_{t+1} \mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right)$.*

Define the set

$$Z_t(\psi) = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^s | -\mathcal{F}_t^T \mathcal{B}^T \mathcal{Q}_{t+1} \mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t z = \mathcal{F}_t^T \mathcal{B}^T \psi \right\}. \tag{26}$$

One consequence of Lemma 5 is that $Z_t(\psi)$ is nonempty for all $t = 0, \ldots, N-1$ and for all $\psi \in \mathbb{R}^{6n}$.

Lemma 6. *For any $t = 0, \ldots, N-1$ and for any $\psi \in \mathbb{R}^{6n}$, if $z_1, z_2 \in Z_t(\psi)$, then $\mathcal{F}_t z_1 = \mathcal{F}_t z_2$.*

Proof (Theorem 2): We resort to dynamic programming to solve (18) with $\delta = 0$. The term $\sum_{t=0}^{N} \operatorname{trace}\left(\widehat{P} Q_t\right)$ in (18) does not depend on $\gamma(0, N)$. Define the optimal cost-to-go function for information $\mathcal{I}_t$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J_N^*(\mathcal{I}_N) = \quad & \min_{e_N} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathcal{H}\xi_N\|_{Q_N}^2 \,\middle|\, \mathcal{I}_N \right] \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \epsilon_N = 0 \end{aligned}, \tag{27}$$

$$\begin{aligned} J_t^*(\mathcal{I}_t) = \quad & \min_{e_t} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathcal{H}\xi_t\|_{Q_t}^2 + J_{t+1}^*(\mathcal{I}_{t+1}) \,\middle|\, \mathcal{I}_t \right] \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \epsilon_t = 0,\ \mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t \in \Xi_{t+1} \end{aligned}. \tag{28}$$

Equations (27) and (28) restrict the attack at each time t to be recursively feasible.

We begin with $t = N$. At time N, the attack e_N does not affect the value of $\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathcal{H}\xi_N\|_{Q_N}^2\right]$, so we choose e_N only to satisfy the constraint $\epsilon_N = \mathcal{C}_N \xi_N + \mathcal{D}_N e_N = 0$. Thus, we have $e_N = -\mathcal{D}_N^\dagger \mathcal{C}_N \xi_N$, and $J_N^*(\mathcal{I}_N) = \xi_N^T \mathcal{Q}_N \xi_N + \Pi_N$, where $\mathcal{Q}_N = \mathcal{H}^T Q_N \mathcal{H}$ and $\Pi_N = 0$. Proceeding to $N-1$, we first reformulate the constraints. Applying Lemma 3, the constraint $\mathcal{A}\xi_{N-1} + \mathcal{B}e_{N-1} \in \Xi_N$ becomes

$$\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1 \mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t\right) = 0. \tag{29}$$

Combining (29) with the constraint $\epsilon_{N-1} = 0$ and using the fact that $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{B} = \widehat{\mathcal{B}}$, we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{N-1}\xi_{N-1} + \mathcal{D}_{N-1}e_{N-1} = 0, \tag{30}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{N-1}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{N-1}$ are given by (23). To solve (28), we eliminate the constraint in (30) (following [30]) and consider attacks e_{N-1} of the form

$$e_{N-1} = \mathcal{F}_{N-1}z_{N-1} - \mathcal{D}_{N-1}^{\dagger}\mathcal{C}_{N-1}\xi_{N-1}, \tag{31}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{N-1} = I_s - \mathcal{D}_{N-1}^{\dagger}\mathcal{D}_{N-1}$. Equation (31) describes all recursively feasible e_{N-1} since $\mathscr{R}\left(\mathcal{F}_{N-1}\right) = \mathscr{N}\left(\mathcal{D}_{N-1}\right)$.

After eliminating constraints and performing algebraic manipulations, (28) becomes

$$J_{N-1}^{*}\left(\mathcal{I}_{N-1}\right) = \xi_{N-1}^{T}\mathcal{H}^{T}\mathcal{Q}_{N-1}\mathcal{H}\xi_{N-1} + \Pi_N + \operatorname{trace}\left(\Sigma_\nu \mathcal{K}^{T}\mathcal{Q}_N\mathcal{K}\right) + \min_{z_{N-1}} \bar{\xi}_{N-1}^{T}\mathcal{Q}_N\bar{\xi}_{N-1}, \tag{32}$$

where $\bar{\xi}_{N-1} = \left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_{N-1}^{\dagger}\mathcal{C}_{N-1}\right)\xi_{N-1} + \mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_{N-1}z_{N-1}$. The optimal z_{N-1} satisfies

$$0 = \mathcal{F}_{N-1}^{T}\mathcal{B}^{T}\mathcal{Q}_N\bar{\xi}_{N-1}. \tag{33}$$

As a consequence of Lemma 5, such a z_{N-1} exists. One particular z_{N-1} that satisfies (33) is

$$z_{N-1} = -\left(\mathcal{F}_{N-1}^{T}\mathcal{B}^{T}\mathcal{Q}_N\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_{N-1}\right)^{\dagger}\mathcal{F}_{N-1}^{T}\mathcal{B}^{T}\mathcal{Q}_N\left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_{N-1}^{\dagger}\mathcal{C}\right)\xi_{N-1}. \tag{34}$$

There may be more than one z_{N-1} that satisfies (34). Manipulating (34), we have that z_{N-1} satisfies

$$-\left(\mathcal{F}_{N-1}^{T}\mathcal{B}^{T}\mathcal{Q}_N\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_{N-1}\right)z_{N-1} = \mathcal{F}_{N-1}^{T}\mathcal{B}^{T}\psi, \tag{35}$$

with $\psi = \mathcal{Q}_N\left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_{N-1}^{\dagger}\mathcal{C}\right)\xi_{N-1}$. By definition, all z_{N-1} that satisfy (35) belong to $Z_{N-1}\left(\psi\right)$. Then, since $e_{N-1} = \mathcal{F}_{N-1}z_{N-1} - \mathcal{D}_{N-1}^{\dagger}\mathcal{C}_{N-1}\xi_{N-1}$, we have, from Lemma 6, that the optimal attack e_{N-1} is unique.

Substituting (34) into (32) and performing algebraic manipulations, we have

$$J_{N-1}^{*}\left(\mathcal{I}_{N-1}\right) = \xi_{N-1}^{T}\mathcal{H}^{T}\mathcal{Q}_{N-1}\mathcal{H}\xi_{N-1} + \Pi_{N-1}, \tag{36}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}_{N-1} = {} & \mathcal{H}^{T}Q_{N-1}\mathcal{H} + \left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_{N-1}^{\dagger}\mathcal{C}_{N-1}\right)^{T}\mathcal{Q}_N\left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_{N-1}^{\dagger}\mathcal{C}_{N-1}\right) \\ & - \left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_{N-1}^{\dagger}\mathcal{C}_{N-1}\right)^{T}\mathcal{Q}_N\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_{N-1}\left(\mathcal{F}_{N-1}^{T}\mathcal{B}^{T}\mathcal{Q}_N\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_{N-1}\right)^{\dagger}\mathcal{F}_{N-1}^{T}\mathcal{B}^{T}\mathcal{Q}_N\left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_{N-1}^{\dagger}\mathcal{C}_{N-1}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

and $\Pi_{N-1} = \Pi_N + \operatorname{trace}\left(\Sigma_\nu\mathcal{K}^{T}\mathcal{Q}_N\mathcal{K}\right)$. Repeating the dynamic programming procedure for $t = N-2, \ldots, 0$, we find that the optimal attack has the same form as (34), where we replace $N-1$ with t. ■

V. Attacks Under General Detection Constraints

In this section, we solve (18) with positive δ. We design a procedure to find the sequence $\gamma(0, N)$ that minimizes J under the constraint $\|\epsilon_t\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta$ for $t = 0, \ldots, N$ (the optimal attack does not have a closed form). This procedure becomes computationally intensive for large N. Thus. we also design a less computationally-intensive procedure that finds a sub-optimal and feasible attack sequence.

A. Optimal Attack with $\delta > 0$

For this section only, we introduce the following notation: let $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_t}[\cdot]$ denote the expectation taken over ξ_t, and let $\mathbb{E}_{\{\xi_k\}_t^N}[\cdot]$ denote the expectation taken over $\xi_t, \ldots, \xi_N$. Further, define the operator π_t as $\pi_t(\gamma(t,N)) = e_t$. That is, π_t is an operator that takes an attack sequence over $N-t+1$ time steps and returns the first attack. To solve (18) with $\delta > 0$, we consider, for $t = 0, \ldots, N-1$, the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_t^*(t,N) = \quad & \underset{\gamma_t(t,N)}{\operatorname{argmin}} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\{\xi_k\}_{t+1}^N}\left[\sum_{k=t}^{N} \|\mathcal{H}\xi_k\|_{Q_k}^2\right] \\ & \text{s.t.} \qquad \|\epsilon_k\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta, k = t, \ldots, N \end{aligned}, \tag{38}$$

where $\gamma_t(t,N) = \{e_t, \ldots, e_N\}$ is an attack sequence in which each attack $e_t, \ldots, e_N$ only depends on ξ_t.[3] This differs from the definition of $\gamma(t,N)$, in which each attack $e_t, \ldots, e_N$ depends on $\xi_t, \ldots, \xi_N$, respectively. Problem (38) has a convex objective and convex constraints, so it can be efficiently solved.

Theorem 3 (Optimal Attack Strategy with $\delta > 0$ Detection Constraint)**.** *Algorithm 1 gives an attack sequence $\gamma(0,N)$ that solves* (18) *with $\delta > 0$.*

Algorithm 1 Optimal Attack with $\delta > 0$

1: **Initialize:** $\mathcal{I}_0 \leftarrow \{\widetilde{y}_0\}$
2: **for** $t = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1$ **do**
3: Solve (38), $e_t \leftarrow \pi_t(\gamma_t^*(t,N))$, $\mathcal{I}_{t+1} \leftarrow \{\mathcal{I}_t, \widetilde{y}_{t+1}, e_t\}$
4: **end for**
5: $e_N \leftarrow \gamma_{N-1}^*(N,N)$

Algorithm 1 works as follows. At time step t, for $t = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1$, we find $\gamma_t^*(t,N)$, the sequence of attacks depending only on ξ_t that solves problem (38). The attack e_t is then set as the first attack in the sequence $\gamma_t^*(t,N)$. In the last ($(N+1)^{\text{th}}$) time step, the attack e_N is set as the last attack component of the sequence $\gamma_{N-1}^*(N-1,N)$. By construction, every attack e_t produced by Algorithm 1 is recursively feasible: after attacking the system with e_t, the subsequence $\gamma_t^*(t+1,N)$ is a feasible attack sequence at time $t+1$. In order to prove Theorem 3, we require the following Lemma from [25]:

Lemma 7 ([25])**.** *Let $g(\xi,u)$ be a function such that, for any ξ, $\min_{u\in\mathcal{U}} g(\xi,u)$ exists and $\mathcal{U}$ is a class of functions for which $\mathbb{E}_\xi[g(\xi,u)]$ exists. Then, $\min_{u(\xi)\in\mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E}_\xi[g(\xi,u(\xi))] = \mathbb{E}_\xi[\min_{u\in\mathcal{U}} g(\xi,u)]$.*

Proof (Theorem 3): From problem (18), we have that the optimal cost-to-go function at time t, $J_t^*(\xi_t)$, is

[3]The state ξ_t is a sufficient statistic for the information set $\mathcal{I}_t$.

defined as

$$J_N^*(\xi_N) = \begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{e_N} & \|\mathcal{H}\xi_N\|_{Q_N}^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_N\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta \end{array}, \tag{39}$$

$$J_t^*(\xi_t) = \|\mathcal{H}\xi_t\|_{Q_t}^2 + \begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{e_t} & \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t+1}}\left[J_{t+1}^*(\xi_{t+1})\,|\xi_t\right] \\ \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_t\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta,\ \mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t \in \Xi_{t+1} \end{array}. \tag{40}$$

Let $\widetilde{\gamma}(0,N) = \{\widetilde{e}_0, \ldots, \widetilde{e}_N\}$ denote the attack sequence produced by Algorithm 1. The attack sequence has the form

$$\widetilde{\gamma}(0,N) = \{\pi_0(\gamma_0^*(0,N)), \ldots, \pi_N(\gamma_N^*(N,N))\}. \tag{41}$$

To show that $\widetilde{\gamma}(0,N)$ is an optimal attack sequence, we show that each attack $\widetilde{e}_t = \pi_t(\gamma_t^*(t,N))$ is the optimal attack at time t, for $t = 0, \ldots, N-1$.[4]

In order to show that $\widetilde{e}_t$ is the optimal attack, we prove the intermediate result that, for $t = 0, \ldots, N-1$,

$$J_t^*(\xi_t) = \begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{\gamma_t(t,N)} & \mathbb{E}_{\{\xi_k\}_{t+1}^N}\left[\sum\limits_{k=t}^{N} \|\mathcal{H}\xi_k\|_{Q_k}^2\right] \\ \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_k\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta, k = t, \ldots, N \end{array}. \tag{42}$$

We resort to induction. In the base case, we show that (42) is true for $t = N-1$. Consider the right hand side of (42) for $t = N-1$. We have

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{\gamma_{N-1}(N-1,N)} & \mathbb{E}_{\xi_N}\left[\sum\limits_{k=N-1}^{N} \|\mathcal{H}\xi_k\|_{Q_k}^2\right] \\ \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_k\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta, k = N-1, N \end{array} = \begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{\gamma_{N-1}(N-1,N-1)} & \|\mathcal{H}\xi_{N-1}\|_{Q_{N-1}}^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\xi_N}\left[\|\mathcal{H}\xi_N\|_{Q_N}^2\right] \\ \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_{N-1}\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta, \xi_N \in \Xi_N \end{array}, \tag{43}$$

$$= \begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{e_{N-1}} & \|\mathcal{H}\xi_{N-1}\|_{Q_{N-1}}^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\xi_N}\left[J_N(\xi_N)|\xi_{N-1}\right] \\ \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_{N-1}\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta, \\ & \mathcal{A}\xi_{N-1} + \mathcal{B}e_{N-1} \in \Xi_N \end{array}, \tag{44}$$

$$= J_{N-1}^*(\xi_{N-1}). \tag{45}$$

Equation (43) follows from the right hand side of (42) because the term $\|\mathcal{H}\xi_{N-1}\|_{Q_{N-1}}^2$ is not affected by $\gamma_{N-1}(N-1,N)$ and because the term $\gamma_{N-1}(N,N)$ does not affect the objective but only needs to satisfy the constraint $\|\epsilon_N\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta$. Equation (44) follows from (43) because the minimization in (43) is over $\gamma_{N-1}(N-1,N-1)$, which, by definition, is a function of ξ_{N-1}. Thus the expectation over ξ_N in (43) refers to the conditional expectation over ξ_N given ξ_{N-1}.

In the induction step, we assume that (42) is true for $t+1$ and show that it is true for t. The right hand side of (42) for t becomes,

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{e_t} & \left[\|\mathcal{H}\xi_t\|_{Q_t}^2 + \widetilde{J}_t(\xi_t)\right] \\ \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_t\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta, \mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t \in \Xi_{t+1} \end{array}, \tag{46}$$

[4]We ignore the attack $\widetilde{e}_N$ because it does not affect the cost associated with $\widetilde{\gamma}(0,N)$.

where $\widetilde{J}_t(\xi_t)$ is defined as

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min\limits_{\gamma_t(t+1,N)} & \mathbb{E}_{\{\xi_k\}_{t+1}^N}\left[\sum\limits_{k=t+1}^{N}\|\mathcal{H}\xi_k\|_{Q_k}^2\right] \\ \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_k\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \le \delta, k=t+1,\ldots,N\end{array}. \tag{47}$$

The expression in (46) follows from the right hand side of (42) because $\gamma_t(t,N)$ can be partitioned as $\{e_t, \gamma_t(t+1,N)\}$, ξ_t does not depend on $\gamma_t(t+1,N)$, and a feasible $\gamma_t(t+1,N)$ in (47) exists if and only if e_t is recursively feasible.

Further manipulating (47), we have

$$\widetilde{J}_t(\xi_t) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t+1}}\left[\widehat{J}_{t+1}(\xi_{t+1})\,\middle|\,\xi_t\right], \tag{48}$$

where $\widehat{J}_{t+1}(\xi_{t+1})$ is defined as

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min\limits_{\gamma_{t+1}(t+1,N)} & \mathbb{E}_{\{\xi_k\}_{t+2}^N}\left[\sum\limits_{k=t+1}^{N}\|\mathcal{H}\xi_k\|_{Q_k}^2\right] \\ \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_k\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \le \delta, k=t+1,\ldots,N\end{array}. \tag{49}$$

Equation (48) follows from (47) because the minimization in (47) is over $\gamma_t(t+1,N)$, which, by definition, is a function of ξ_t, so the expectation over $\xi_{t+1},\ldots,\xi_N$ refers to the conditional expectation given ξ_t. We also use Lemma 7 to exchange the minimization operation and expectation over ξ_{t+1} in (47) to derive (48). By the induction hypothesis, we have $\widehat{J}_{t+1}(\xi_{t+1}) = J_{t+1}^*(\xi_{t+1})$. Substituting back into (48) and (46) shows that (42) is true for t.

To conclude the proof of Theorem 3, we note that, as a result of (42), for $t=0,\ldots,N-1$,

$$\begin{array}{rll}\widetilde{e}_t = & \underset{e_t}{\text{argmin}} & \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t+1}}\left[J_{t+1}^*(\xi_{t+1})\,|\xi_t\right] \\ & \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_t\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \le \delta,\ \mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t \in \Xi_{t+1}\end{array}. \tag{50}$$

Because $\widetilde{e}_t$ is optimal for $t=0,\ldots,t=N-1$ and $\widetilde{e}_N$ does not affect the cost, $\widetilde{\gamma}(0,N)$ is an optimal attack sequence. ■

B. Windowed Attack Algorithm with $\delta > 0$

Although Algorithm 1 gives the optimal attack sequence with $\delta > 0$, it is also computationally expensive. In the first time step ($t=0$), in order to find the optimal attack, Algorithm 1 aims to find an optimal N-length attack sequence subject to N constraints. In each subsequent time step, the length of the attack sequence over which the optimization occurs and the number of constraints in the optimization only decreases by 1. Even though (38) is a convex optimization, if N is large, then, in order to find the optimal attack, Algorithm 1 must repeatedly solve large (convex) optimization problems, each with a large number of constraints.

To find an attack sequence in a less computationally-intensive manner, we consider the windowed attacker optimization problem:

$$\begin{array}{rll}\widehat{\gamma}_t(t,t+W-1) = & \underset{\gamma_t(t,t+W-1)}{\text{argmin}} & \mathbb{E}_{\{\xi_k\}_{t+1}^{t+W-1}}\left[\sum\limits_{k=t}^{t+W-1}\|\mathcal{H}\xi_k\|_{Q_k}^2\right] \\ & \text{s.t.} & \|\epsilon_k\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \le \delta, k=t,\ldots,t+W-1, \\ & & \left\|\widehat{P}_{N-(t+W-1)}\mathcal{G}\xi_{t+W}\right\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \le \delta,\end{array} \tag{51}$$

where $W \in \{2, \ldots, N+1\}$ is a predetermined window size chosen by the attacker.[5] The goal of problem (51) is to find a W-length attack sequence that minimizes the attacker's cost over W time steps.

We use problem (51) to find a suboptimal attack sequence in less computationally intensive manner than Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 2 Windowed Attack with $\delta > 0$

1: **Initialize:** $\mathcal{I}_0 \leftarrow \{\widetilde{y}_0\}$
2: **for** $t = 0, 1, \ldots, N - W$ **do**
3: Solve (51), $e_t \leftarrow \pi_{N-W+1}\left(\widehat{\gamma}\left(t, t+W-1\right)\right)$, $\mathcal{I}_{t+1} \leftarrow \{\mathcal{I}_t, \widetilde{y}_{t+1}, e_t\}$
4: **end for**
5: **for** $t = N - W + 1, \ldots, N$ **do**
6: Solve (38), $e_t \leftarrow \pi_t\left(\gamma_t^*\left(t, N\right)\right)$, $\mathcal{I}_{t+1} \leftarrow \{\mathcal{I}_t, \widetilde{y}_{t+1}, e_t\}$
7: **end for**
8: $e_N \leftarrow \gamma_{N-1}^*\left(N, N\right)$

Algorithm 2 works as follows. At each time step t, for $t = 0, \ldots, N - W$, we find a W-length attack sequence (that depends only on ξ_t) that minimizes the attacker's cost over W time steps. We set the attack e_t to be the first component of the attack sequence $\widehat{\gamma}_t\left(t, t+W-1\right)$. At each time step t, for $t = N-W+1, \ldots, N$, we determine the attack e_t in the same way as in Algorithm 1.

The additional constraint $\left\| \widehat{P}_{N-(t+W-1)} \mathcal{G} \xi_{t+W} \right\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta$ ensures that the attack e_t, as determined by Algorithm 2, is recursively feasible. The attack e_t is the first component of a sequence $\widehat{\gamma}_t\left(t, t+W-1\right)$ that satisfies all constraints in (51). The additional constraint requires that, for the state ξ_{t+W}, which depends on $\widehat{\gamma}_t\left(t, t+W-1\right)$, there exists an attack sequence $\widehat{\gamma}_t\left(t+W, N\right)$ such that $\sum_{k=t+W}^{N} \|\epsilon_k\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta$. Since the sum of $\|\epsilon_k\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2$ from $k = t+W$ to $k = N$ is no greater than δ, we have $\|\epsilon_k\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta$ for all $k = t+W, \ldots, N$. Thus, the attack sequence $\{\widehat{\gamma}_t\left(t, t+W-1\right), \widehat{\gamma}_t\left(t+W, N\right)\}$ satisfies $\|\epsilon_k\|_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}}^2 \leq \delta$ for all $k = t, \ldots, N$, so the attack e_t must be recursively feasible.

In each time step of Algorithm 2, we minimize cost over an attack sequence of length no greater than W, and subject to no more than $W+1$ constraints. Thus, even if N is large, an attacker can use Algorithm 2 to find a feasible attack sequence without the computational expense of Algorithm 1 by choosing W to be small. One drawback of a small window size W is that the resulting attack sequence incurs a larger cost J. We verify the trade off between window size and optimality gap via numerical simulation in Section VI.

VI. Numerical Examples

We demonstrate the proposed attack strategies under detection constraints with separate examples for the $\delta = 0$ and $\delta > 0$ cases. We consider the linearized state space model of a helicopter provided by [31]. The model

[5]We do not consider the case of $W = 1$ since, for any time t, the current attack e_t does not affect the value of ξ_t.

is comprised of 10 states and 4 actuators. Due to space constraints, we refer the reader to [31] for a detailed explanation of the model states and the numerical values of the A and B matrices. The helicopter has sensors for each of the state variables ($C = I_{10}$). In our examples, we consider the following statistical properties: $\overline{x}_{t_0} = 0, \Sigma_x = 5I_{10}, \Sigma_v = 10^{-3}I_{10}, \Sigma_w = 10^{-4}\text{diag}\left(6, .1, 2, 2, .1, 6, 2, 2, 2, .1\right)$.

For all numerical examples, the attacker has target state

$$x^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 8.2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T.$$

The attacker has the following Q_t matrix for all t:

$$Q_t = \text{diag}(\ .1,\quad 3,\quad .1,\quad .1,\quad .1,\quad 4,\quad .1,\quad .1,\quad .1,\quad .1\ ),$$

which means that the attacker only cares about manipulating the $x_{(2)}$ and $x_{(6)}$ components of the helicopter's state, corresponding to vertical and lateral velocity, respectively. The system starts running at $t = -75$, and the attacker attacks the system from $t = 0$ to $t = 75$ (i.e., $N = 75$).

First, we consider an attacker, denoted as "A1", that can attack all of the actuators and eight of the sensors – the attacker cannot alter the sensors measuring $x_{(8)}$ (yaw rate) and $x_{(9)}$ (roll angle). Figure 1 shows the effect of the optimal attack (A1) with the $\delta = 0$ constraint. From time $t = 0$ to $t = 75$, the attack computed using



Fig. 1: Effect of the optimal attack (A1) under $\delta = 0$ constraint. Top: system states versus time. The black dotted line is the target state. Bottom: detection statistic versus time

Theorem 2 moves the system to the target state while satisfying the $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = 0$ constraint. Second, we consider an attacker, denoted as "A2", that can attack inputs $u_{(3)}$ and $u_{(4)}$ and manipulate the sensor values measuring $x_{(2)}, x_{(6)}, x_{(7)},$ and $x_{(10)}$. Figure 2 shows that, for the attacker (A2), the optimal attack with $\delta = 0$ constraint does not successfully move the system to the target state. This is because the attacker is not powerful enough and cannot attack enough sensors and actuators.

For demonstrating the attack strategies with $\delta > 0$, we consider the attacker (A2). In the implementation of Algorithms 1 and 2, we solve the optimization problems (38) and (51) using MOSEK [32]. First, we consider the



Fig. 2: Effect of the optimal attack (A2) under $\delta = 0$ constraint. Top: system states versus time. The black dotted line is the target state. Bottom: detection statistic versus time

optimal attack from Algorithm 1 under the constraint $\delta = 1$. Figure 3 shows that, by following Algorithm 1, the



Fig. 3: Effect of the optimal attack (A2) under $\delta > 0$ constraint. Top: system states versus time. The black dotted line is the target state. Bottom: detection statistic versus time. The black dotted line is δ.

attacker (A2) is able to move the system to the target state while satisfying the $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq 1$ constraint. We then consider the attacker (A2) using the windowed attack algorithm (Algorithm 2) with window size $W = 5$. Figures 4 shows that, like the optimal attack, the suboptimal attack computed using Algorithm 2 also successfully brings the system state to the target state while satisfying the $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq 1$ constraint.

The performance of Algorithm 2 depends on the window size W. We evaluate the cost attained by Algorithm 2 (by attacker (A2)) as a function of the window size W and the value of the constraint bound δ. For each W and each value of δ, we compute the optimality gap of Algorithm 2 as the average cost of 10000 simulations. The



Fig. 4: Effect of the windowed attack (A2) under $\delta > 0$ constraint. Top: system states versus time. The black dotted line is the target state. Bottom: detection statistic versus time. The black dotted line is δ.

optimal cost is the one obtained by Algorithm 1, which we compute as the average of 10000 simulations. Figure 5



Fig. 5: Performance of Algorithm 2 as a function of window size.

shows that, as window size W increases, the cost achieved by Algorithm 2 approaches the optimal cost.

VII. Conclusion

In this paper we studied attackers with control objectives and detection constraints against CPS. We formulated a cost function that captures the attacker's control objectives and defined constraints that relate to the probability of the attack being detected. In the case that the attacker's probability of being detected is constrained to be the false alarm rate of the detector, we showed that the optimal attack strategy is a linear feedback of an augmented system state calculated from the attacker's information set. Under more general constraints to the attacker's effect on the CPS' detection statistic, we provided an algorithm to find the optimal attack sequence and a second, less computationally intensive, algorithm to find a feasible, sub-optimal attack. Finally, we illustrated our attack strategies through numerical examples involving a remotely-controlled helicopter under attack.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Lemma 2

Proof: We resort to induction. The base case of $t = N$ is true by the definition of Ξ_N. In the induction step, we assume there exists a sequence of attacks $\gamma(t+1, N)$ such that $\|\epsilon_{t+1}\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta, \ldots, \|\epsilon_N\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$ if and only if $\xi_{t+1} \in \Xi_{t+1}$, and we show that there exists a recursively feasible e_t if and only if $\xi_t \in \Xi_t$.

(If) Let $\xi_t \in \Xi_t$. Then there exists e_t such that $\left\|\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}\xi_t + \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}e_t\right\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$ and $\xi_{t+1} = \mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t + \mathcal{K}\nu_{t+1} \in \Xi_{t+1}$. Since $\xi_{t+1} \in \Xi_{t+1}$, by the induction hypothesis, there exists $\gamma(t+1, N)$ such that $\|\epsilon_{t+1}\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta, \ldots, \|\epsilon_N\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$. Concatenating e_t and $\gamma(t+1, N)$, we have that $\gamma(t, N) = \{e_t, \gamma(t+1, N)\}$ is an attack such that $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta, \ldots, \|\epsilon_N\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$, which means that e_t is recursively feasible.

(Only If) Let e_t be a recursively feasible attack. Then, there exists $\gamma(t, N) = \{e_t, \gamma(t+1, N)\}$ such that $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta, \ldots, \|\epsilon_N\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$. Since the subsequence $\gamma(t+1, N)$ satisfies $\|\epsilon_{t+1}\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta, \ldots, \|\epsilon_N\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$, we have, by the induction hypothesis, that $\xi_{t+1} = \mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t + \mathcal{K}\nu_{t+1} \in \Xi_{t+1}$. Since $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$, we have $\left\|\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}\xi_t + \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}e_t\right\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} \leq \delta$. This means that $\xi_t \in \Xi_t$. ∎

B. Proof of Lemma 3

Proof: We resort to induction. In the base case, we show that $\Xi_N = \mathscr{N}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1\mathcal{G}\right)$. By definition of Ξ_N, we have $\xi_N \in \Xi_N$ if and only if there exists e_N such that $\left\|\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}\xi_N + \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}e_N\right\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = 0$. Applying the result of Lemma 1 and noting that $\mathcal{G}\xi_N = \theta_N$, we have that $\left\|\widehat{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{G}\xi_N + \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}e_N\right\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = 0$ if and only if $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1\mathcal{G}\xi_N = 0$. Thus, we have $\xi_N \in \Xi_N$ if and only if $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1\mathcal{G}\xi_N = 0$, which shows that $\Xi_N = \mathscr{N}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1\mathcal{G}\right)$.

In the induction step, we assume that $\Xi_{t+1} = \mathscr{N}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{N-t}\mathcal{G}\right)$, and we show that $\Xi_t = \mathscr{N}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{N-t+1}\mathcal{G}\right)$. By definition of Ξ_t, we have $\xi_t \in \Xi_t$ if and only if there exists e_t such that $\left\|\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}\xi_t + \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}e_t\right\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = 0$ and $\xi_{t+1} = \mathcal{A}\xi_t + \mathcal{B}e_t + \mathcal{K}\nu_{t+1} \in \Xi_{t+1}$. By the induction hypothesis $\Xi_{t+1} = \mathscr{N}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{N-t}\mathcal{G}\right)$. Thus, we have $\xi_{t+1} \in \Xi_{t+1}$ if and only if $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{N-t}\mathcal{G}\xi_{t+1} = 0$. Applying the results of Lemma 1, we then have that $\xi_{t+1} \in \Xi_{t+1}$ if and only if there exists an attack sequence $\gamma(t+1, N)$ such that, starting from state ξ_{t+1}, we have $\|\epsilon_{t+1}\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = \cdots = \|\epsilon_N\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = 0$. Concatenating e_t and $\gamma(t+1, N)$, we have that $\gamma(t, N) = \{e_t, \gamma(t+1, N)\}$ is an attack sequence such that, starting from state ξ_t, we have $\|\epsilon_t\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = \cdots = \|\epsilon_N\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = 0$. Since there exists such an attack sequence $\gamma(t, N)$, we have $\min_{\gamma(t,N)} \sum_{k=t}^{N} \|\epsilon_k\|^2_{\Sigma_\nu^{-1}} = 0$. Applying the results of Lemma 1, we have $\xi_t \in \Xi_t$ if and only if $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{N-t+1}\mathcal{G}\xi_t = 0$, which shows that $\Xi_t = \mathscr{N}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{N-t+1}\mathcal{G}\right)$. ∎

C. Proof of Lemma 4

Proof: We resort to induction. In the base case $t = N$, we have $\mathcal{Q}_N = \mathcal{H}^T Q_N \mathcal{H}$ by definition. In the induction step, we assume that $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1} = \mathcal{H}^T Q_{t+1}\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{U}_{t+1}$ for some $\mathcal{U}_{t+1} \succeq 0$, and we show that there exists $\mathcal{U}_t \succeq 0$ such that $\mathcal{Q}_t = \mathcal{H}^T Q_t \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{U}_t$. From the induction hypothesis, we have that $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1} \succeq 0$ since $Q \succ 0$ and $\mathcal{U}_{t+1} \succeq 0$. Then, by algebraic manipulation of equation (25), we have

$$\mathcal{Q}_t = \mathcal{H}^T Q_t \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{X}_t^T \mathcal{Q}_{t+1} \mathcal{X}_t, \tag{52}$$

where $\mathcal{X}_t = \left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_t^{\dagger}\mathcal{C}_t\right) - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right)^{\dagger} \times$
$\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\left(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\mathcal{D}_t^{\dagger}\mathcal{C}_t\right)$. Thus, $\mathcal{U}_t = \mathcal{X}_t^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{X}_t \succeq 0$, since $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1} \succeq 0$. ■

D. Proof of Lemma 5

Proof: Trivially, we have $\mathscr{R}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right) \subseteq \mathscr{R}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\right)$. We now show that $\mathscr{R}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\right) \subseteq \mathscr{R}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right)$ by showing that $\mathscr{N}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right) \subseteq \mathscr{N}\left(\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right)$.

Let $\mu \in \mathscr{N}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right)$, and, by contradiction, suppose that $\mu \notin \mathscr{N}\left(\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right)$. Then, we have $\mathcal{F}_t\mu \neq 0$. By definition of $\mathcal{F}_t$, we have $\mathcal{D}_t\mathcal{F}_t\mu = 0$, which means that $\Psi\mathcal{F}_t = 0$. Since the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \Gamma \\ \Psi \end{bmatrix}$ is injective, $\Psi\mathcal{F}_t\mu = 0$ means that $\widetilde{\mu} = \Gamma\mathcal{F}\mu \neq 0$. Using the results of Lemma 4 and the structure of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^T\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\mu =& \mu^T\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{U}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\mu + \\ & \widetilde{\mu}^T Q_{t+1}\widetilde{\mu}.\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

The first term on the right hand side of (53) is nonnegative since $\mathcal{U}_{t+1} \succeq 0$, and the second term on the right hand side of (53) is positive since $\widetilde{\mu} \neq 0$ and $Q_{t+1} \succ 0$. Thus, we have $\mu^T\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\mu > 0$, which contradicts the fact that $\mu \in \mathscr{N}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right)$. Thus, we have $\mu \in \mathscr{N}\left(\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right)$ and $\mathscr{N}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right) \subseteq \mathscr{N}\left(\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right)$. This means that $\mathscr{R}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\right) \subseteq \mathscr{R}\left(\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\right)$. ■

E. Proof of Lemma 6

Proof: Let $z_1, z_2 \in Z_t(\psi)$, and suppose, by contradiction, that $\mathcal{F}_t z_1 \neq \mathcal{F}_t z_2$. Let $\mu = z_1 - z_2$, which means $\mathcal{F}_t\mu \neq 0$. Since $z_1, z_2 \in Z_t\left(\psi\right)$, we have $\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\mu = 0$. Following the proof of Lemma 5, we have that if $\mathcal{F}_t\mu \neq 0$, then $\mu^T\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\mu > 0$, which contradicts the fact that $\mathcal{F}_t^T\mathcal{B}^T\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{F}_t\mu = 0$. Thus, we have $\mathcal{F}_t z_1 = \mathcal{F}_t z_2$. ■

REFERENCES

[1] A. A. Cárdenas, S. Amin, Z. Lin, Y. Huang, C. Huang, and S. Sastry, "Attacks against process control systems: Risk assessment, detection, and response," in *Proc. 6th ACM Symposium on Information, Computer and Communications Security*, Hong Kong, Mar. 2011, pp. 355–366.

[2] A. A. Cárdenas, S. Amin, and S. Sastry, "Research challenges for the security of control systems," in *Proc. of the 3rd Conf. on Hot Topics in Security*, San José, CA, Jul. 2008, pp. 1–6.

[3] K. Koscher, A. Czeskis, F. Roesner, S. Patel, T. Kohno, S. Checkoway, D. McCoy, B. Kantor, D. Anderson, H. Shacham, and S. Savage, "Experimental security analysis of a modern automobile," in *Proc. of the 2010 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, Oakland, CA, May 2010, pp. 447–462.

[4] S. Peterson and P. Faramarzi, "Iran hijacked US drone, says Iranian engineer," *Christian Science Monitor*, vol. 15, Dec. 2011.

[5] D. Shepard, J. Bhatti, and T. Humphreys, "Drone hack," *GPS World*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 30–33, Aug. 2012.

[6] A. Teixeira, D. Pérez, H. Sandberg, and K. H. Johansson, "Attack models and scenarios for networked control systems," in *Proc. 1st ACM International Conf. on High Confidence Networked Systems*, Beijing, China, Apr. 2012, pp. 55–64.

[7] Y. Mo and B. Sinopoli, "Integrity attacks on cyber-physical systems," in *Proc. of the 1st ACM International Conf. on High Confidence Networked Systems*, Beijing, China, Apr. 2012, pp. 47–54.

[8] Y. Liu, M. K. Reiter, and P. Ning, "False data injection attacks against power systems in electric power grids," in *Proc. of the 16th ACM Conf. on Computer and Communications Security*, Chicago, IL, Nov. 2009, pp. 21–32.

[9] H. Fawzi, P. Tabuada, and S. Diggavi, "Secure estimation and control for cyber-physical systems under adversarial attacks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 1454–1467, Jun. 2014.

[10] Y. Shoukry and P. Tabuada, "Event-triggered state observers for sparse sensor noise/attack," *Arvix e-prints*, Sep. 2013.

[11] M. Pajic, J. Weimer, N. Bezzo, P. Tabuada, O. Sokolsky, I. Lee, and G. Pappas, "Robustness of attack-resilient state estimators," in *2014 ACM IEEE International Conf. on Cyber-Physical Systems*, Berlin, Germany, Apr. 2004, pp. 163–174.

[12] F. Pasqualetti, F. Dorfler, and F. Bullo, "Attack detection and identification in cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 58, no. 11, pp. 2715–2729, Nov. 2013.

[13] Y. Chen, S. Kar, and J. M. F. Moura, "Cyber-Physical Systems: Dynamic sensor attacks and strong observability," in *Proc. of the 40th IEEE International Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, Brisbane, Australia, Apr. 2015, pp. 1752–1756.

[14] ——, "Dynamic attack detection in Cyber-Physical Systems with side initial state information," *ArXiv e-prints*, Mar. 2015.

[15] Y. Mo and B. Sinopoli, "False data injection attacks in control systems," in *Proc. of the 1st Workshop on Secure Control Systems*, Stockholm, Sweden, Apr. 2010, pp. 56–62.

[16] R. Zhang and P. Venkitasubramaniam, "Stealthy control signal attacks in scalar lqg systems," in *Proc. of the 2015 IEEE Global Conf. on Signal and Information Processing (GLOBALSIP)*, Orlando, FL, Dec. 2015, pp. 240–244.

[17] Y. Chen, S. Kar, and J. M. F. Moura, "Cyber-physical attacks constrained by control objectives," in *Proc. of the 2016 American Control Conf. (ACC)*, Boston, MA, Jul. 2016, pp. 1185–1190.

[18] ——, "Cyber physical attacks with control objectives," *ArXiv e-prints*, Jul. 2016.

[19] A. S. Willsky, "A survey of design methods for failure detection in dynamic systems," *Automatica*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 601–611, Nov. 1976.

[20] J. Löfberg, "Oops! I cannot do it again: Testing for recursive feasibility in MPC," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 550–555, Mar. 2012.

[21] P. O. M. Scokaert and J. B. Rawlings, "Constrained linear quadratic regulation," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 43, no. 8, pp. 1163–1169, Aug. 1998.

[22] A. Bemporad, M. Morari, V. Dua, and E. N. Pistikopoulos, "The explicit linear quadratic regulator for constrained systems," *Automatica*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 3–20, Jan. 2002.

[23] A. Sideris and L. A. Rodriguez, "A Riccati approach for constrained linear quadratic optimal control," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 84, no. 2, pp. 370–380, 2011.

[24] Y. Chen, S. Kar, and J. M. F. Moura, "Cyber physical attacks with control objectives and detection constraints," in *Proc. of the 55th IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Las Vegas, NV, Dec. 2016.

[25] J. L. Speyer and W. H. Chung, *Stochastic Processes, Estimation, and Control*. SIAM, 2008, ch. 9.

[26] Y. Mo, S. Weerakkody, and B. Sinopoli, "Physical authentication of control systems: Designing watermarked control inputs to detect counterfeit sensor outputs," *IEEE Control Syst. Mag.*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 99–109, Feb. 2015.

[27] S. Weerakkody, Y. Mo, and B. Sinopoli, "Detecting integrity attacks on control systems using robust physical watermarking," in *Proc. of the 53rd IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Los Angeles, CA, Dec. 2014, pp. 3757–3764.

[28] Y. Mo and B. Sinopoli, "On the performance degradation of cyber-physical systems under stealthy integrity attacks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, pp. 1–6, Nov. 2015, Early Access.

[29] D. Rappaport and L. M. Silverman, "Structure and stability of discrete-time optimal systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 227–233, Jun. 1971.

[30] S. Boyd, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004, ch. 9.

[31] H. R. Dharmayanda, A. Budiyono, and T. Kang, "State space identification and implementation of H_∞ control design for small-scale helicopter," *Aircraft Engineering and Aerospace Technology*, vol. 82, no. 6, pp. 340–352, 2010.

[32] MOSEK ApS, *The MOSEK optimization toolbox for MATLAB manual. Version 7.1 (Revision 28).*, 2015. [Online]. Available: http://docs.mosek.com/7.1/toolbox/index.html